DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 452 303 UD 034 125

AUTHOR	Liederman, Sally A.; Wolf, Wendy C.; York, Peter
TITLE	Some Thoughts about Public Will.
INSTITUTION	Center for Assessment and Policy Development, Bala Cynwyd, PA.
PUB DATE	2000-02-00
NOTE	36p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Advocacy; *Child Health; Citizen Participation; *Family Health; *Health Promotion; Information Dissemination; Philanthropic Foundations; Public Health; *Public Support; Racial Bias
IDENTIFIERS	*Social Marketing

ABSTRACT

This report examines how various groups are working to influence improved results for children and families through public will strategies, defining public will as the steps required to change the outcomes for children and families. There are seven chapters: (1) "Introduction"; (2) "A Conceptual Framework for Public Will Work" (what social marketing is and implications); (3) "Lessons from Campaigns Outside of the Children's Area" (common themes of the National Rifle Association, Christian Coalition, National Breast Cancer Coalition, and AIDS activists; implications; and consistencies and inconsistencies between child advocates' thinking and the common strategies of successful campaigns not in the children's arena); (4) "Landscape of the Public Will Work in the Children's Area: Foundations and Organizations" (foundations, organizations, conclusions based on interviews, identification of gaps in public will work, and identification of opportunities); (5) "Landscape: Messages" (values that underlie message development and race and racism as they apply to public will work); (6) "Summary of Findings and Implications"; and (7) "Potential Next Steps" (potential areas of foundation investment, including cross-foundation collaborations). An appendix contains a foundation/organization interview list. (Contains 69 bibliographic references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 452 303

SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT PUBLIC WILL

Sally A. Leiderman
Wendy C. Wolf
Peter York

February 2000

Center for Assessment and Policy Development

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD034125

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Zapf
Center for Assessment + Policy Development

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CENTER FOR ASSESSMENT AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT

CAPD

SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT PUBLIC WILL

SALLY A. LEIDERMAN
WENDY C. WOLF
PETER YORK
MARCH 1997

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 2

II. A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR PUBLIC WILL WORK 4
What is social marketing? 6
Implications 7

III. LESSONS FROM CAMPAIGNS OUTSIDE OF THE CHILDREN'S AREA 9
Common Themes of the NRA, NCC, CC and AIDS Activists 9
Implications 13
Consistencies and Inconsistencies Between Child Advocates' Thinking and The Common Strategies of Successful Campaigns not in the children's arena 14

IV. LANDSCAPE OF THE PUBLIC WILL WORK IN THE CHILDREN'S AREA — FOUNDATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS 14
Landscape — Foundations 15
Landscape — Organizations 17
Learnings Based on Interviews 18
Identification of Gaps in Public Will Work 19
Identification of Opportunities 20

V. LANDSCAPE — MESSAGES 20
Values that Underlay Message Development 24
Race and Racism as They Apply to Public Will Work 24

VI. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS 25
Landscape and State of the Art 25
Implications 27

VII. POTENTIAL NEXT STEPS 28
Potential Ares of Foundation Investment, Including Cross-Foundation Collaborations 28

BIBLIOGRAPHY 31

APPENDIX 34

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

I. INTRODUCTION

CAPD is pleased to share this report on how various groups are working to influence improved outcomes for children and families through public will strategies. The term "public will" does not have a common or precise meaning in general use in the children and family policy arena. For example, people in the field often use the terms public will, public engagement, social marketing and media advocacy interchangeably, though each describes a particular way of interacting with various constituencies to influence children's outcomes. Further, many in the field do not distinguish between: public will, as an expression of how the public feels and acts; and public will work, the strategies required to alter public feeling and action. This distinction matters especially to those who believe that the American public viewed broadly already has the public will to improve children's outcomes, so that public will work needs to focus not on changing public will, but on mobilizing it. These are not just semantic differences, but reflect the state of development of common ideas and a language to further this work.

Thus, a starting point for our work, and for this memorandum, is to define our terms. For the children's field, it is clear that current thinking about public will work includes at least efforts to educate, inform or influence the public (or particular segments of the public) about children and family issues, usually with the intent of having them support or oppose actions at a programmatic, system or policy level. This work requires attention to individual and collective values, attitudes and behaviors; it involves communication, organizing, advocacy, effective use of data and data-based arguments and other persuasive strategies and messages. Many foundations, policymakers and advocacy organizations in the children's area have implemented public will strategies that reflect this definition.

The field has also increasingly recognized that public will work involves engaging people through the variety of roles they play with regards to children and family outcomes. For example, advocates and foundations are attempting to engage parents as parents, but also as citizens who vote and as taxpayers with an interest in the allocation of resources. In thinking about the public to be engaged, we also include system-actors, legislators and others sometimes considered the "policy elite." In fact, one of the first things to be recognized in public will work is how many people, in how many different roles, influence outcomes for children and families.

For purposes of this report, public will work is defined as the steps required to change behaviors that influence the outcomes of children and families. This language is meant to focus public will work on the specific behaviors to be changed, which, depending on the outcome being sought, may include the individual behaviors of people in direct contact with children (parents, teachers, child care providers, etc.), the voting behavior of citizens of a particular community, the voting behavior of legislators, the organizing behavior of child advocates, the regulatory behavior of government agencies, etc.

Efforts aimed at the broad public (media campaigns, for example) may be part of this mix, to the extent that broad public support is needed to set the stage for, create, sustain and/or expand the particular changes being sought. However, the same concepts and techniques that apply to changing behavior of individuals through broad public efforts are also relevant to changing the behaviors of system actors with respect to their institutions, and changing the behaviors of community actors with respect to their colleagues and neighbors.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

This way of thinking about public will work — as work to change specific behaviors required to change outcomes — underlies the current multi-pronged health, teen pregnancy and violence prevention strategies of the Kaiser and California Wellness Foundations, a number of effective public will efforts outside the children's area, and the different but related concepts of media advocacy (as applied by the Benton Foundation, for example) and social marketing (as applied by Bill Novak, Allen Andreasen and Martin and Glantz, for example). We have used this definition in looking at what the children's field is doing in the public will area, and also as an analytic framework that helps to identify gaps or opportunities in the field. The following section talks more about this as a conceptual framework and its implications for steps that foundations and their grantees can take to improve outcomes for children and families.

A review of current thinking and potential next steps in public will work is particularly timely for the children's policy field as more programs, communities, states, foundations, advocates and others struggle to change outcomes for children and families at a neighborhood, community or state level. As a field, we have learned something about how best to support parents to provide for the healthy development of their children; and we have begun to understand and effect the kinds of community-level opportunities, services, institutions and systems that many believe can promote child and family well-being. We still have much to be learned in this area. However, even what we already know is not well reflected in what we, individually or collectively, do for children.

Our review suggests there are many reasons, including at least:

- Lack of consensus about the kinds of individual and collective actions needed to improve outcomes for children. Lack of consensus reflects substantive, political, ideological, racial and other differences often related to values people hold;
- Insufficient development or implementation of organizing structures and networks, strategies, messages and other tools to influence how people behave as a broad public;
- A growing belief that we have done insufficient work to understand or have been unwilling to recognize the behaviors that would need to be changed to improve children and family outcomes; and
- Until now, a dearth of comprehensive, sustained and coordinated public will work among those who share a similar agenda for children and family outcomes. A reasonable standard of comparison might be work of the magnitude and at the level of sophistication and effectiveness of the work of, for example, the Christian Coalition or the National Rifle Association in pursuit of their goals.

Many children's advocates, foundations, program implementers, reformers and policy analysts are thinking about communication, media advocacy, social marketing and public will strategies as a necessary component of efforts designed to improve children and family outcomes, and/or as worthwhile investments in and of themselves. New ideas and planned work provide opportunities both for knowledge development and collaboration. Further, if we think about all of the currently separate public will efforts as a collective whole, it is possible to identify messages and strategies that can be reinforced and gaps that might be filled with new ideas and new investments.

The remainder of the progress report explores more fully these themes raised in this introduction. It is based on:

- A review of the literature and ideas being shared among those thinking about public work as it applies to the children's area;

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

- Interviews with 26 individuals, representing 14 foundations and 6 organizations, who are contemplating or have done public will work to improve outcomes for children and families. These interviews include individuals with different ideological perspectives;
- A review of the public will related products of 10 organizations or initiatives;
- A review of four selected effective public will campaigns outside the children's arena. This review was based on interviews and written materials; and
- A very selective review of literature related to social marketing, media advocacy, public service announcements and other specific techniques for influencing or changing public and individual behavior.

A bibliography and lists of foundations, organizations and individuals interviewed are included in an appendix.

It is important to note that this paper is a progress report, and not the final result, of work that could be done to inform foundations, advocates and practitioners fully about concepts, gaps and opportunities for investment in public will work over the next five years. For example, in the course of doing this scan and analysis, we have identified a number of primary sources for survey, polling and focus group data that have never been examined together for their contribution to development of public will messages.

In addition, the field continues to argue out their differences and pool their learnings; so far as we can determine, there have been only a few opportunities for people thinking about public will across different outcomes (e.g., health or education), within key areas (school readiness) or from different technical perspectives (e.g., public relations, media advocacy, social marketing and civic engagement) to share their experiences and thoughts. Given the current interest in public will and rapidly emerging ideas and new work, the ideas and recommendations below are very much works in progress.

The remainder of this report is organized into the following sections:

- Section II: More thoughts about a conceptual framework for public will and public will work
- Section III: Lessons learned from effective public will work outside the children and family area
- Section IV: The current landscape of public will work in the children and family area — foundations and organizations
- Section V: The current landscape of public will work in the children and family area — messages
- Section VI: Summary of findings and implications
- Section VII: Gaps, opportunities and potential next steps

II. A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR PUBLIC WILL WORK

This section of the progress report fleshes out in more detail some of the current thinking about how to approach public will work. As noted in the introduction, we found more consensus in practice than in language about public will work among foundation officials, advocates and advertising, public relations and media relations professionals. Practical experience has contributed to development of tools, strategies and messages that are part of people's "bag of tricks" in the field. But there are also a few conceptual frameworks that could help tie those tips and tools to a better articulated, and perhaps better tested, theory about how to promote change in behavior that leads to improved outcomes for children and families.

The framework we are describing is theoretical and based on a particular bias — it asserts that the goal of public will work is to change the behaviors that

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

create improved outcomes for children and it argues for a framework consistent with what we know about how to change behaviors. It asserts that social change comes from aggregated individual change within a social environment, and that social and individual conditions are completely interrelated. Advertising theory, organizational change theory, media advocacy theory and social marketing theory all contribute to an understanding of how to bring about change.

At the same time, these theories are based on fairly linear thinking[1] about cause and effect, and they do not carefully separate individual consciousness and action from social consciousness and action. These aren't just academic distinctions, because, in fact, the ability to do effective public will work depends entirely on how well one understands what it takes to create change. The more accurately the field understands how the world works, the better job we will do in our public will work.

One framework we have found particularly useful is social marketing broadly defined, described more fully below. Several foundations, including California Wellness, Kellogg and Robert Wood Johnson, are using this term and its component principles and strategies to frame their work. As a concept and set of principles and strategies, it has many similarities to what the field has called "an outcomes orientation" or using an "eyes on the prize strategy," both of which also emphasize the need to create strategies that are most likely to create the changes in behaviors that would lead to the desired outcomes. Media advocacy contributes to better public will work by focusing on very specific framing and other techniques for media to promote a children's agenda. So far as we can determine, there is nothing inconsistent about these approaches.

Social marketing, because it draws from both social policy work and marketing and marketing research, contributes at least three important ideas:

- That the consumer (and not the policymaker) makes the ultimate decision about whether or not policies for children will be adopted, on the ground, where children's lives are affected;
- That our end goal is to create action, not just to inform or educate; and
- That there are lots of intervening decisions, behaviors and conditions that need to be lined up correctly for consumer decisions to be favorable to the policy we are trying to implement.

We are not arguing that the framework of social marketing is the only, or even the best, way to think about doing more effective public will work, just that we find it very useful and want to share it with people for whom the ideas may be new and helpful. There are highly experienced people in the field who find social marketing ideas more useful for thinking about individual action, and less relevant for collective change. Because we are taking the position that collective action is based on aggregated individual actions of parents, system actors, legislators and the like, that distinction is less important to us.

Further, we recognize that the idea of social marketing — with its connotation of manipulating the public in directions it doesn't want to go or to buy products of no use from a social policy perspective — feels unethical or uncomfortable to some in the field. However, as noted above, we find the principles sound and helpful. As an ethical issue, we particularly like the emphasis on viewing policies from the consumer's perspective, and the implicit warning to be sure that proposed policies are palatable as well as potentially useful.

[1] ***By contrast to chaos theory, for example.***

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

What is Social Marketing?[2]

Social marketing is a term that people use to describe the application of commercial marketing techniques to changing behavior with regard to social issues. The product being marketed is a behavior change — regular use of contraceptives; use of feeding methods to control infant diarrhea; enrollment of children in good quality child care; passage of legislation that requires funds saved through refinancing to be reinvested in particular programs or geographic areas; passage of a referendum to reform schools, etc. The specific analyses and strategies called for by social marketing do a particularly good job of clarifying what it takes to create effective public will strategies.

Social marketing:

- Lays out a conceptual framework about how to change behavior based on the different stages that people move through before they act;
- Shares some of the conceptual underpinnings, and has many of the same implications, as working from a strengths-based rather than deficit-based approach to family or community strengthening. Social marketing and strengths-based practice assume that consumers (clients): are decision makers and expert on their own behavior; prefer to behave in their own best interests; are not monolithic, but must be approached in ways that take into account current circumstances, life experiences, cultural norms and community norms. The approaches are quite consistent, therefore, in calling for certain kinds of system reform and supports, activities and opportunities.
- Because of these underpinnings, using social marketing encourages policymakers and program implementers to take a critical look at the behavior being promoted. It forces us to consider whether the policy we want makes sense to the consumer — if we can't sell it, is it the consumer or the behavior (or both) that needs to change?
- In addition, the questions social marketing calls are helpful in forcing that kind of critical look. For example, to do good social marketing, one needs to understand: Does the consumer want what we are promoting? Would it be easier and more effective to alter what we are promoting before trying to market the behavior? What is the impact of community norms on individual action and when and how must we attempt to change community norms to change individual behaviors? What is the competition for our behavior — doing nothing; a different set of behaviors? — and how must the competition be addressed for different segments of the market at different stages of willingness or ability to practice the desired behaviors? Are the benefits of changing tangible in a timely manner for the intended target market?

There are at least two good examples of social marketing related to children's issues in the United States: the development and use of child care during World War II to allow women to work; and the immunization of children with the newly developed oral polio vaccine in the 1950s. Both efforts included tailoring of products to satisfy consumer need; both took specific steps to counter consumer objectives and change prevailing norms; both had substantial system back-up. Both efforts were mostly successful in meeting their limited objectives.

Since then, to the best of our knowledge, we have not implemented in the United States similarly complete or successful social marketing strategies to improve child outcomes. One substantial barrier is a lack of consensus about the outcomes to be achieved, and the behaviors necessary to achieve them. This becomes clear when communities try to define and improve school readiness. Even among child advocates there are areas of disagreement. For example, do we as a field value universal home visiting or not? Out of home pre-school experiences for all children?

[2] ***This subsection of the report draws substantially from an earlier memo we prepared for the Annie E. Casey Foundation (November 1996).***

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

Different cultural norms about discipline? Whether or not children of teens can be raised adequately by young parents?

The Benton Foundation and others have tried to create coalitions that could agree on a joint agenda. To implement an effective change strategy, social marketers would likely argue that the field needs to agree on a few carefully stated behavioral changes at either the individual or collective level (on the order of a Contract with America, NRA or Christian Coalition platform) to focus our work. Our take is that we also need to establish some common understanding (or know where we disagree) on the behaviors of systems, professionals, regulators, legislators and citizens that need to change for these agreed upon behaviors to occur.

Andreasen notes three major obstacles to broader use of social marketing: an under-appreciation of what it can accomplish; the fact that people think they are doing it when they are not; and prior to publication of this book, lack of an agreed upon set of "conceptual underpinnings" (preface, xi - xiii). Using these conceptual underpinnings to frame analyses and action could be very useful to the field. To take the most basic example, social marketing reminds us that (Andreasen, page 5)

- The final objective is to influence the behavior of a target market, and the behaviors of others that influence the behavior of a target market;
- Target behaviors compete with comfortable alternatives;
- Community pressures can make it difficult to bring about change even if the target market finds it attractive; and
- Critical supporting agencies (...systems) must help out if the behavior change program is to be successful.

Our take on the most basic implications of these points for our work includes: we need to continue to develop outcome-oriented public will efforts; we need to understand fully the appeal of current behaviors and the incentives and sanctions that will make the behaviors we are promoting palatable; we need to focus both on changing individual behaviors and collective attitudes, where there are barriers to change and/or we need to re-examine policies to see where they conflict with values and cultural norms; and good public will efforts require system change and vice versa.

We find social marketing such a potentially useful tool because it lays out how to do these things very clearly and with a great deal of sophistication about methods, and because, as noted above, in the course of doing social marketing one is forced to think through all of the behavior changes (individual and collective) that create improved outcomes.

Implications

In CAPD's opinion, this framework is useful at both a micro and macro level. For instance, next steps for the field might include, but are certainly not limited to, a major national campaign or coordinated public will strategy to create a children's movement — though that is one approach that people in the foundation community and elsewhere are beginning to talk about. The social marketing approach provides a very precise framework for such an effort.

However, we also suggest that the framework is useful more broadly:

- As an analytic tool to assess the practicality and palatability of social policies that the field proposes. Does anyone want them? Can they be implemented given current social norms and conditions? Is it possible to change social norms and conditions to make policies palatable and implementable, and/or do we need to do a better job linking policies with prevailing social norms and values of targeted audiences?

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

- As a tool to develop specific public will strategies to support individual programs, local initiatives, place-based strategies, etc. Here, the framework-laid against a careful analysis of people's sense of what it will take to improve the outcome of interest (their theory of change) allows people to:
  - identify the specific behaviors to be changed
  - identify the audiences who need to be reached to change those behaviors
  - identify the ways in which those audiences can be reached and influenced
  - target strategies as well as public will work to reach and influence those audiences and to make the necessary individual, program, institutional and system changes

  We have begun using this framework as part of our work with the William Caspar Graustein Memorial Fund Children's First Initiative, an effort to improve school readiness in eight communities in Connecticut. Using a social marketing/public will framework, communities are getting better at articulating what it will take to improve school readiness, parental engagement and school performance outcomes and to begin to analyze how to effect key audiences.

  Interestingly, in some communities, this has allowed collaborative groups running the initiative to resist pressure to implement broad public awareness campaigns. They have been able to say they aren't ready to take on the broad public, because they don't know yet what they must ask them to do — what behavior they want them to change or influence.

- As a template in which to fit former, current and planned public will efforts in a given locality, against a given outcome (school readiness, adolescent health and safety, family support, community development), or at a more generic level (Stand for Children, Who's Side Are You On) in order to see how far along the field is toward a comprehensive public will strategy of enough power to alter national policy, or to bring certain effective programs (Head Start, universal health care) to scale at a state or national level.

  This is essentially how we have used the framework in this report, as a template against which to look at gaps and opportunities in the field in order to identify areas of potential knowledge development and investment.

The remainder of this report fleshes out what we have learned to date about the state of the art in some specific parts of public will work. Our review focuses on several relatively narrow areas — common elements of effective public will campaigns outside the children and family policy area, public will work, identified as such, being sponsored by foundations and some key organizations, and message development. These are relatively understudied areas in the children and policy field, we believe, and many people in the field have expressed an interest in knowing more about current thinking and practice in these areas.

Given the conceptual framework just laid out for thinking about public will work, we urge the field to give more serious consideration to reviewing what we know and don't know about effective behaviors that improve outcomes for children and families. We need to be intellectually rigorous on two fronts — first, we have seldom looked at these behaviors from the perspective of competing values and choices, cultural norms and palatability. As described above, this limits our ability to use some of the most potentially effective public will techniques.

Second, as someone once said, "the problem isn't what we don't know, it's what we know that ain't necessarily so." Failure to challenge ourselves on that point limits us even more.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

III. LESSONS FROM CAMPAIGNS OUTSIDE OF THE CHILDREN'S AREA

There are a number of lessons about how to engage the public and alter specific behaviors in support of specific outcomes that can be gleaned from experiences outside the children's area. This section of the progress report reviews common themes among public will campaigns of the National Rifle Association (NRA), the Christian Coalition (CC), the National Breast Cancer Coalition (NBCC), and AIDS activism. We chose these social movements to meet the following criteria:

- Their public will work stimulated or created an observable change in individual or collective behavior as evidenced by new or greatly expanded public investments, change in national and/or local policy and improved public awareness;
- Their public will work changed the behavior not just of highly committed audiences, but also those previously on the fence about the issue; and
- They represent different ideological perspectives, thus, common elements work regardless of the specific issue or its potential audience.

Simultaneous with our work, some other researchers and scholars (Sonenshein, Skocpol and Deardourff) have reviewed historical experiences and drawn lessons about common themes of effective public will efforts. We have referenced their findings where appropriate.[1]

Common Themes of the NRA, NBCC, CC and AIDS Activists

Seek outcomes which are clear, concrete and specifically focused. Identify the behaviors needed to achieve those outcomes, and remain very focused on changing those behaviors.

Each of these movements has chosen to focus on a specific set of outcomes, and is very disciplined about not becoming distracted from that goal. For example,

- The NBCC's goal is to keep scientists focused on preventing or curing breast cancer, in part by increasing federal spending on basic breast cancer research. Even though they are under considerable pressure to do so, the NBCC does not become involved in advocating for mammography, which they believe distracts public attention from preventing or curing breast cancer; and
- The CC has identified intact marriages, school prayer, two parent families, elimination of abortion rights as outcomes they want to achieve.

This theme very much relates to what Sonenshein has identified as a part of all American social movements — a movement has to be about something the public thinks is of the utmost importance. For example if a movement attempts to get people to invest in children, society probably won't listen because they don't see children, per se, as an issue. However, if a children's movement focuses instead on economic security issues for parents, people will act on behalf of children because the loss or lack of income is of pressing concern. In other words, by defining the problem in terms of self-interest, the problem becomes of the utmost importance.

[1] ***Raphael Sonenshein, Theda Skocpol and John Deardourff have conducted and published studies concerning American social movements, applying historical lessons learned from American social movements to a children's movement, and affecting legislatures and legislative decision making, respectively. Their work was published in the Wingspread Conference Summary and Highlights publication.***

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

Divide outcomes into concrete, winnable goals. Celebrate interim successes.

Long-term goals need to be divided into smaller, winnable co ponents. This allows the celebration of success, which is critical if a movement is to be sustained until long-term goals have been met. Often, celebrating success takes the form of reporting progress on goals and recognizing individual efforts that went into their completion. The following examples highlight the ways in which successful movements outside the children's area celebrate success.

- The Christian Coalition targets particular elected officials for re-election or defeat, and reports its progress after each election. Additionally, it promotes individuals and/or supports them if they seek political office when they work hard toward meeting specific movement objectives; and
- The NBCC establishes research protocols that it would like to see adopted, and lets everyone know when these are adopted in a particular study.

In many ways this strategy is in synch with what researchers and scholars studying American social movements have found — the need to celebrate public policy changes is very important to keep people motivated enough to work on long-term goals. Toward this end, social movements spend some effort publicizing the accomplishment of legislative milestones (e.g., Social Security Act, Family Leave Act, etc.). Another way in which successful American social movements celebrate success is to have the chief promoter(s) of the cause (i.e., the leader(s) of the movement) offer congratulations and recognition to individuals for outstanding efforts. This lends credibility to the celebration of success.

Have one unifying message which can be tailored to speak to different target audiences.

The strategy for developing a unifying message which is tailored to different target audiences is two fold. A movement needs to develop a specific message which speaks to the "core" constituency (i.e., the folks who naturally align themselves with the philosophy of the movement); and develop a broad message that speaks to "fence sitters" (i.e., those who have entertained the philosophical thinking of the movement, but haven't committed to its principles). There are many examples of this common theme:

- The CC has developed messages that are aimed at the broader public (i.e. fence sitters) in which religious values are usually couched in secular terms.
- The NRA's broad message is that if we don't fight for all weapons, we'll lose all weapons, which is an infringement of our second amendment rights. The core constituent message is that every person in the US should own, know how to use, and carry a gun.
- The broad message of the NBCC is that there is no cure or understanding of the causes of breast cancer; one in eight American women will get it and more funds must be devoted to finding treatments and cures. The constituency message is that breast cancer is a feminist issue and that the reason we are no more near a cure than 30 years ago is that the medical research establishment is male dominated.

Many researchers and scholars in the child advocacy field are beginning to draw similar conclusions about the need for a unifying message. For example, Deardourff concluded that legislators don't sense a unified message from the child advocacy community. With respect to crafting a unifying message, Sonenshein found in his study of American social movements that people connect with campaigns that tap into their self-perceptions as Americans through values like fairness, individual responsibility and community. In other words, every policy that doesn't pass the "moral filter" will fail no matter how practical and no matter how many dollars are saved at the back end compared to the front-end investments.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

Sell a product or service that is highly relevant to the targeted audience.

According to the experience of the NRA, Christian Coalition and AIDS activists, this strategy serves multiple purposes. It generates revenue, provides access to the target audience (who identify themselves by purchasing the product or service, a very cost-effective way of reaching an audience), increases the number of people that can be counted as members or believers, and shows constituents that the organization can deliver something of value. For example:

- The NRA (through contracts with the Defense Department) is able to offer discounted gun prices; it engages youth through shooting camps and competitions. To get the discount or participate, one has to join the NRA. One result, for example, is that this strategy has allowed the NRA to claim that it has a growing number of youth who support its cause.
- Some AIDS organizations offer access to and discounts on drugs.
- The CC owns radio and television stations that offer programming which solicits funds in return for spiritual guidance and healing (e.g., the 700 club).

One of the important goals of implementing this strategy is to increase membership in the movement (this usually means becoming a member of the movement's lead organization). This tactic implies that providing a product improves the likelihood of bringing on board fence sitters because their consumer interest can then be followed up with a sales pitch for the movement's message and its inherent behavioral change.

Emphasize local organizing at least as much, and often more than state or national organizing.

Each of the effective public will efforts examined here believes that the key to its success has been its aggressive, labor-intensive, expensive and never-ending focus on grassroots organizing. Of particular relevance to the children and family arena, the Christian Coalition and the National Breast Cancer Coalition found it necessary to and have developed strategies specifically aimed at helping women (often parents with many other responsibilities) become highly sophisticated and effective workers in their organizations and vocal public spokespersons. Legislators are particularly responsive to well-organized grassroots efforts that include their constituencies.

Strategies have included providing materials aimed at women and their interests and concerns about "speaking up," providing training on the issues, and on organizing and advocacy skills; making it possible for women to travel to Washington and their state capitals to meet directly with legislators; and creating strong personal relationships that provide peer support and practical help for women to fit in these responsibilities in their daily lives (this was crucial for breast cancer survivors to participate, as it would be to allow parents of young children to be active supporters).

Organizing locally includes trying to get core members of the movement to be elected to school boards, county commissions, city councils, etc. Essentially, focusing locally allows a movement to develop highly effective lobbying networks, which in turn can affect policy-making decisions at the local, state and national levels of government. Examples of non-children's campaigns using this strategy are as follows:

- The CC, NBCC, NRA, and AIDS activists all invest time, money and other resources in tending, informing, placating and strengthening local networks, and where relevant, influencing local policymaking bodies.
- The CC has: organized neighborhoods; worked closely with local churches to raise political awareness; sponsored training workshops; identified friendly voters; disseminated voter education materials; identified potential school board candidates and supported others; helped effective school board members run for higher office; organized religious study groups for youth during school time and used existing laws to have students released from school to attend; and, used their supporters on school boards to ban books they find inappropriate or offensive.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

- the NBCC has created rigorous science training programs to bring women up to an adequate level of expertise to participate more effectively as "consumer advocates" on panels that oversee clinical trials. Training is open only to members of NBCC's grassroots network both as a service and a reward for effective local work.

Researchers and scholars reviewing prior social change experiences point out that the power of organizing locally is well established when one examines successful American social movements. They confirm that the following strategies must also be in place in order to support and further develop grassroots organizations:

- Effective movements typically take the time to celebrate successful public policy advocacy efforts; celebrating legislative milestones is an excellent way to further fuel the movement, especially at the local level; and
- Local elites must be included in local organizing. Grassroots organizations are more likely to be heard if legislators believe there is strong local leadership backing their efforts and their future re-election.

Allow both confrontational and mainstream advocates to coexist

More "radical" or "fringe" groups within a movement can be used strategically to place a problem within the public debate. In effect, having both confrontational and mainstream advocates allows decision makers (at the policy making level) to view mainstream options as palatable when weighed against the cost of the "radical" ideal. For example the AIDS movement uses ACT-UP to bring attention to their causes, but they use other, less vocal groups to negotiate with government and the research community. These mainstream groups, and their messages, are better received in part because they are perceived as less radical than ACT-UP.

Other successful American social movements allude to an additional purpose for incorporating and acknowledging the radical group within a movement — they often serve as the engine for the movement because of their obsession for remedying the problem. In fact, it is often this group that initiated organizing around a particular problem, and leaving them out of the picture would neglect the foundation from which many movements began. Mother's Against Drunk Driving is a good example of a radical group which in many ways served as the catalyst for a social movement — the anti-drinking and driving campaign. Additionally, it is this group of mothers who provide much of the movement's staying power. Thus, it is fair to say that it is important for groups to include within their umbrella those with passion for the work — even when that passion challenges the patience needed to work within existing systems.

In general, the study of successful American social movements also indicates that with respect to creating political action, having both a confrontational and mainstream group allows fence-sitting constituents to see the mainstream group's ideas as palatable when contrasted against the fringe group. This helps to make a social movement successful because without the fringe group, fence sitters might see the mainstream group as too radical.

Identify a specific "enemy" around which supporters and the "swing vote" can coalesce.

Identifying an enemy can serve as a rallying cry for a movement. Additionally, if an enemy is identified which can be perceived as a threat to fence sitters (i.e., the swing vote), then they are more likely to become core members. Examples of non-children's campaigns' attempts to identify specific enemies to rally against include:

- The NRA has identified as the enemy anybody (especially within the government) who wants to take away any weapons from the American people, thus abridging their second amendment rights and leading to the loss of other rights to privacy and individuality;

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

- NBCC and AIDS activists share very similar enemies: the traditional medical research establishment which has concentrated their resources and energies on issues of interest to (straight) males; and
- The Christian Coalition has identified its enemies as those in moral disarray.

The study of successful American social movements indicates that there is a step-by-step process for using enemies to fuel a movement. The first step is to take a stand on a problem; once this occurs, opponents will surface in reaction. Then, a movement needs to use these opponents to strategically bring public attention to the issue or problem. If a group does not take a position and make it public, political opponents will provide their own version of that position before the movement has an opportunity to state its case. Once this occurs, a movement is placed in a defensive position, which is not a safe place if one wants the public to believe in the cause.

Reach out to potential allies among larger enemy groups on an issue-by-issue basis.

Identifying an enemy is important, but that does not mean that all members of the opposition should be considered foes. A movement may need allies among the opposition group when compromises are necessary for making policy strides toward its long-term goals and objectives. Also, by building allies among the enemy, a movement co-opts some of its energy. In addition, reaching out to potential allies allows the movement to seem inclusive rather than exclusive. Inclusiveness can lead to further building and strengthening a power base. Examples of this strategy can be seen in the following:

- The Christian Coalition works with Orthodox Jews to promote the migration of American Jews to Israel and to slow down the immigration of Jews to America; and
- The NBCC works with Republican senators who have taken anti-feminist stands on other issues, but who supported increased funding for breast cancer research.

Deardourff also identifies the need to reach out to potential allies. He argues that child advocates need to consider taking a politically neutral position (we note this is similar to the stance taken by the NBCC) if their goal is to reach out to potential allies. It is this political neutrality that builds alliances with some among the opposition, which in turn leads to making more legislative friends. This is a very important strategy for mobilizing decision makers.

Implications

Leaders of movements not in the children's area point out that while each of the lessons above is important in and of itself, each is also connected to the others. As David Hornbeck wrote in the "Children Achieving" agenda to improve outcomes of the Philadelphia public schools, strategic task 11 is that "we do all of the other 10," and as Doug Nelson said about system reform, "it isn't that we have tried it and found it wanting, it is that we have never fully tried it." A key lesson for public will work in the children and family policy arena, based on review of effective campaigns in other arenas, is that changing behaviors to improve outcomes requires fully comprehensive public will work. Fully comprehensive strategies in the children and family policy area have been hard to come by.

It is fairly easy to see how some of the separate elements of effective public will work reinforce each other. For example, clear goals and benchmarks of progress make it easier to recognize the successes that are strategic to celebrate. This interconnectedness essentially argues that each of the ingredients that make up a successful movement do not serve a purpose in and of themselves; instead, they build on each other in a specific manner that maximizes overall public will efforts.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Consistencies and Inconsistencies Between Child Advocates' Thinking and the Common Strategies of Successful Campaigns Not in the Children's Arena

As noted above, and not surprisingly, there are many consistencies between the common elements of the successful public will efforts we reviewed (the NRA, the CC, the NRA, and AIDS activism) and what child advocates are beginning to identify based on their study of American social movements. In summary, they all view the following strategies as very important:

- Seeking outcomes which are clear, concrete and specifically focused;
- Developing a unifying message which connects interests to each constituent's perceptions of him/herself as an American through values like fairness, individual responsibility and community;
- Emphasizing local organizing; and
- Identifying an enemy against which a movement can rally.

Clearly, however, public will work in the children's area does not meet the standards that the above lessons imply: we are not clear about the specific set of outcomes we want to achieve: we have not divided our outcomes into little winnable pieces whose accomplishments can be celebrated; our local efforts are fragmented; we have not tied the desired outcomes to a set of values salient for our audiences; and we haven't established revenue-generation strategies. Thus, while many in the field are highly focused and clear about the behaviors that need to be changed to improve particular outcomes, our public will strategies are not usually coordinated at a national, state or grassroots level.

The next chapter describes the landscape in the children's area with respect to current and proposed public will work among foundations and organizations. It reinforces the discrepancies between what an overall, effective public will campaign might look like and what we are currently doing in the field, but it also describes some very promising work on which to build.

IV. LANDSCAPE OF PUBLIC WILL WORK IN THE CHILDREN'S AREA — FOUNDATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

This chapter describes the landscape of activities by foundations and organizations on creating the public will to engage the policy elite and citizens on behalf of children. This information was based on phone interviews with numerous individuals, as noted in the appendix.[4] In addition, web pages and printed materials were reviewed.

The first subsection describes current and planned activities of foundations and organizations related to public will work (either within an ongoing initiative or as a separate effort). The second subsection summarizes some of the learnings to date from these activities; the last subsection provides a discussion of opportunities for collaboration and investment based on interviews.

Landscape — Foundations[5]

Foundations are grouped into two categories. The first group includes foundations that have done some work in the broad area of public will; some of these foundations are also exploring additional investments, as noted. Most of the foundations with whom we spoke fall into this group. The second category includes the three foundations with whom we spoke who have incorporated public will work into all, or nearly all, of their efforts to improve outcomes.

[4] ***Generally we interviewed both the communications official and relevant program officials at each foundation. Thus, descriptions reflect both these perspectives.***

[5] ***These were selected in collaboration with the Annie E. Casey Foundation as being among the most likely to do relevant work in the children and family policy arena.***

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

The first category includes:

- Carnegie Corporation has been the driving force behind two major efforts: The Child Care Action Campaign/Communications Consortium effort and the new Carnegie Corporation/AT&T/ Families and Work Institute/Rob Reiner effort — In the First Place — a national public awareness campaign on the first three years of life.
- The Ford Foundation has used innovative communication/building constituency strategies in a few key areas: improving diversity in higher education, community economic development and child care. They are currently discussing issues relating to appropriate audience and dissemination mechanisms for much of their urban poverty work.
- Foundation for Child Development has supported many organizations which are either child advocates or are trying to increase the base of knowledge useful to child advocates, e.g., Center for Budget and Policy Priorities and CLASP, to name just a few. Under the direction of the new president, they are currently in the process of exploring a broader set of investments in the area of creating the public will to invest in children.
- The Heritage Foundation's public will efforts target congressional and White House policy makers by synthesizing macro level data and publishing legislative briefings around family policies. The foundation is also beginning to target human service practitioners who hold traditional values, and the academic research community. The primary messages of Heritage seek to affect family and community breakdown resulting from divorce, separation and cohabitation.
- The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation has used communications and social marketing in a number of their efforts (for example, Tobacco Free Kids, Urban Health Strategies and work on universal health coverage for children). They are exploring two issues: what work should be done nationally to support the local efforts in the Urban Health Initiative; and what public will efforts need to be linked to their potential work on universal health care or universal coverage for children.
- Ewing Kauffman Foundation has used creative communication/building constituency strategies in their current efforts in Kansas City to improve outcomes for children 0-3. They have also just engaged a consultant (Millennium Consulting) to assist them in thinking through how to infuse communications throughout their youth grant making.
- W. K. Kellogg Foundation has used broad communications/building constituency approaches in a number of their efforts: for example, in their Families for Kids initiative, an effort to find permanent homes for those in foster care; and in Middle Start, an effort to involve a broad set of stakeholders in the lives of students during the middle grades. In addition, the message of Bill Richardson, the president of the foundation, in the most recent annual report delineates an interest in breaking down divisiveness between groups and creating more unified responses and solutions to our nations' problems. The foundation is exploring this area.
- The Markle Foundation is involved in developing and assessing the efficacy of new communication strategies (games — such as SimHealth — and multi-user games on the Internet) to help the public better understand difficult social issues (health care crisis and the budget deficit problem).

Historically, they have been one of the few foundations to support segmentation research, a sophisticated technique often used in marketing research to understand the relationships between the attitudes, actions and life circumstances of various groups within the public. Segmentation research aids tremendously in the development of efficacious messages that change behaviors. Because it is expensive work (requiring collection of representative primary data) it is seldom used to support public will work on behalf of public policy agenda.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

- Charles Stewart Mott Foundation has historically invested considerable resources in children, poverty, education and welfare reform. The president, Bill White, has just written an annual report which addresses the need to develop new strategies to engage the public on behalf of this nation's social problems. Communications officials at Mott are keenly interested in the role that communications plays in social change, and are considering work in this area (not necessarily focused on children and family issues).
- The David and Lucile Packard Foundation has supported some major public will work: The Benton Foundation/Ad Council work; and work on next generation advocacy which includes support of the Children's Partnership and two Wingspread conferences. These conferences, which the Annie E. Casey Foundation staff attended, focused on building a constituency, and perhaps a social movement, to improve outcomes for children.

  Packard board and staff are in the middle of a major strategic planning process, triggered by a substantial increase in foundation assets.[*] Staff have suggested to the board that building public will on behalf of children be one of the areas of substantially increased investment over the next several years. Over the next several months, they are to be exploring additional investment options.
- The Pew Charitable Trusts has civic engagement as one of their major thrusts. They continue to consider new strategies in which to invest under this broad rubric. In addition, they are have done some research and are considering publishing a monograph on creating the public and political will in support of child care.

Finally, there are a set of foundations that have built innovative communication activities and building constituency efforts into almost every bit of work that they do.

- The Benton Foundation is an operating foundation with interest in new technologies and the media. It has been willing to use the children's area as a laboratory. Through its work with the Coalition for America's Children, it is in the process of testing innovative technological approaches to building awareness and understanding about numerous children's issues. It is also involved with the Ad Council, creating actionable steps (with further educational activities) emanating from their children's campaign. The Benton Foundation has also co-sponsored conferences to bring specific techniques and research about how the media affects people's perceptions of policy and social issues, and has been working with other foundations and children's advocates to establish an agenda for children on the order of the Contract for America.
- The California Wellness Foundation builds into every major agenda broad efforts to affect the opinions of the public and the policy elite. It funds substantial communications efforts (and survey efforts to support and assess them) in each of its major areas of emphasis, for example in their adolescent pregnancy prevention and violence prevention initiatives. Their efforts focus on affecting the opinions of the policy elite and the general public; furthermore, they have creatively used the opinions of the general public, emanating from key polls, as key points in their arguments to the policy elite.

  In their violence prevention work, they commissioned Martin and Glantz to develop a strategy to inform the state legislature about the value of gun safety legislation, as part of an overall strategy to reposition violence as a public health issue. Martin and Glantz identified 10,000 people in California who had access to state legislators and constituencies of their own (e.g., local ministers).

[*] ***In addition to the increase in assets (and the concomitant increase in grants to be paid), they are also in the process of developing a plan for how to allocate 30 million dollars annually that Mr. Packard would distribute according to his wishes.***

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

The public will work involved providing information to these 10,000 "opinion shapers" in forms that they could then use to make arguments to their constituencies and contacts. This work went on simultaneously with the other components of the Violence Prevention Initiative, including support to community driven anti-violence strategies, development of technical assistance capacity, internships and other forums for the involvement of academics and evaluation.

It is interesting to note that one thing not done yet is to provide the direct expertise of Martin and Glantz to the communities, so that even in this very comprehensive approach there are still additional ways to embed public will work more completely into the initiative.

- The Henry Kaiser Family Foundation concerns itself with changing public opinion about health care issues broadly defined. While much but not all of their work focuses on affecting the opinions of the policy elite, some of their work involves affecting the attitudes of the public more broadly defined. They have creatively used media partnerships with the print media and the entertainment industry, to name just a few. Fascinating efforts include: myth debunking through the Washington Post/Kaiser partnership; a new effort to encourage parents to talk with their children about sensitive personal issues; and various media partnerships with the entertainment industry.

Chart IV.1 summarizes the interests and major activities of foundations as they relate to public will work.

Other Characteristics of the Foundation Landscape with Regards to Public Will Work

The foundations with whom we spoke vary on other dimensions related to their activity around creating the public will in support of children: national/local focus; target audience; and behavior to be affected.

- Foundations vary a lot in terms of their local versus national focus. However, even those with a local focus are concerned about setting the stage at a national level to support policy or other changes required to achieve outcomes for local communities or in place-based initiatives.
- While the target audience of these efforts varies, the vast majority are targeted to the policy elite with fewer efforts targeted on the public.
- Not surprisingly given the different areas in which each foundation works, the behaviors to be affected are not concentrated in any one area. Thus, current public will work is "all over the board", despite the fact that each contributes to affecting the well-being of children.

Landscape — Organizations

Chart IV.2 delineates the multitude of organizations that work in the area of affecting opinions relating to children. The chart indicates their major efforts in the children's area. It illustrates those involved in: policy analyses (and whether the primary target audience is the policy elite or the public); primary data collection through polling or focus group work; the creation or implementation of media and or public relations campaigns; and whether the organization is a membership organization.

The landscape includes the following characteristics:

- Communities and some funders believe there is a dearth of media specialists or other technical assistance to aid local efforts. Our scan suggests that this is not the case. The task is to link qualified specialists (with social policy experience) with local efforts.
- While there are many organizations in the field, there is little organization among them. This contributes to the sense that there are too many simultaneous messages and advocacy efforts on behalf of children and families.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

- Very few of the organizations we reviewed have local affiliates or are umbrella or membership organizations that could drive development of a grassroots effort. Exceptions are the Children's Defense Fund, with a few local affiliates, the Coalition of America's Children and National Association of Child Advocates.
- Among the groups we interviewed, most focus their public will work on policy elites, not the general public or individuals in their roles as parents. Exceptions are the Children's Defense Fund, the Ad Council, Children Now, Child Care Action Campaign and conservative organizations including the Family Research Council, the Hudson Institute and Capital Research Group.

Learnings Based on Interviews

Below are some key learnings that emerged from interviews with the above foundations and organizations:

- Importance of public will work generally
  - Many foundations have come to the realization that garnering the support of the public (creating public will) is a critical component of any attempt to improve outcomes for children. It is as important as and perhaps more important than any particular programmatic strategy.
  - Public awareness efforts by themselves are not sufficient to make a difference; they must be linked to **actionable** steps that can be taken either by the policy elite or the general public.
  - While many foundations have a local interest or are concerned with effecting public will at the local level, they see a need for national strategies.
- Salience of particular children's issues
  - Recent polling suggests that children and the children's agenda are higher on the radar screens of the American public than they were two or four years ago. Yet, interest and concerns of the public are diffuse and are not localized in any one particular area.
- At the same time, other work suggests that education is a "hot button" topic. Education is seen as a safe children's issue, because it has to do with issues outside the home, where we as a society have already acknowledged a public responsibility for outcomes. There is some evidence that the American public is less interested in accepting a public responsibility for children's outcomes that would involve any kind of interference or involvement inside the home.
- There is not consensus in the field about the ways in which to communicate with interested individuals in a way that will garner their support on behalf of children. Child care advocates believe it is essential to tie child care issues to other domestic agendas. Stan Greenberg and others believe that the agenda must speak to the needs of working parents and parental control. (That is, to talk about supporting parents in their role as parents rather than children's entitlements.) Staff of the Benton Foundation believe that we must talk directly about children.
- A key emerging insight has to do with the willingness of the field to talk about the values that underlie our strategies for children. Many believe that we do not have the value set, or have not articulated our value set, in a way that permits us to talk to people as individuals, parents and citizens in ways that are consistent with the desired action.
- The exception are organizations with a conservative or explicitly Christian agenda for children. They are candid and clear about the value set that permits them to link desired results (behaviors to be changed) with actions that people take as individuals, family members, citizens and voters.
- Across numerous efforts, there is a tremendous need to break down the myth about the intractability of the problem. Data especially from public opinion polls can be extremely helpful in identifying myths that needed to be debunked.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

- Strategies
  - Much of the policy work (and communication efforts) of foundations and organizations concerned with improving outcomes for children has focused on engaging the policy elite, and not on engaging a broad constituency of parents and families who could articulate to legislators their concern for this population. The focus on the policy elite is a special concern in light of the fact that legislators comment that children's issues do not have a broad base of active proponents at the local level. Based on this learning, many are calling for a next generation advocacy, which focuses equal attention on building broad constituencies of families as well as affecting the policy elite. Conservative organizations that deal with children's issues, such as the Christian Coalition, the Heritage Foundation, the Family Research Coalition and Capital Research Center, are more attuned to engaging the public directly on policy issues.
  - In some instances, there are learnings to illustrate how data on the opinions of parents and families have been critical in attempting to affect the opinions of policy elite. For example, the California Wellness Foundation collected and shared information with policymakers about parental opinion on access to pregnancy prevention education beyond abstinence and access to contraception. Similarly, the Children's Initiative in Minnesota commissioned a statewide survey to gauge interest in family centers. Results were used to help convince the state legislature to create support for expansion of family centers beyond pilot communities.
  - One or two foundations have quite strategically engaged media partners from the outset. The presence of these media partnerships has provided a multitude of benefits, including providing the foundations with natural distribution mechanisms.
  - A few foundations have recognized that effective engagement concepts involve entertainment, games, etc. For this reason, some foundations have developed communication strategies that involve the entertainment industry, multi-user games on the Internet, and computer games that can be played by an individual.
  - The work that has been done to date often is based on simple segmentation strategies, using gender, ethnic and parental status only. Segmentation models of the kind common to commercial marketing or product development has very seldom been attempted, in part because few funders recognize its value given its cost.

Identification of Gaps in Public Will Work

During these interviews, foundations and organizations were eager to identify critical gaps that might point to areas of potential investment by the field. We queried them as to what they considered as the biggest gaps in our understanding and probed them about six areas (indicated in bold below). In general, most of the foundations and organizations queried believed that we started with a good list of major gaps. However, they made some modifications and additions as outlined below.

- ***Lack of clarity around children and policies being promoted.*** While they agreed with this point, they felt that equally important was the lack of clearly defined actionable steps.
- ***A dearth of language and insights that fit with particular segments of the public and therefore can be used to shape public will messages.*** Almost all interviewed agreed that this was a serious issue worthy of investment.
- ***A dearth of readily accessible tools and communication strategies.*** Many argued that once the work on messages has been completed, the work on tools will follow.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

- ***A dearth of appropriate technical assistance.*** Most did not concern themselves with this. They felt the issue was linking social policy analysts and child advocates with organizations that create communication and public relations campaigns and have worked in the social policy arena.
- ***A dearth of tracking information to understanding the effectiveness of current public will efforts.*** While many saw this as a gap, most were not investing in this strategy unless their communications effort was major. Nevertheless, many supported the notion that KIDS COUNT might track some attitudinal markers.
- ***A dearth of fully developed data-based strategies to make compelling arguments.*** This did not receive much support. However, many commented on the need to take wonderful policy work of progressive policy organizations (like the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities and the Center for Law and Social Policy) and cast findings in ways that link to the values and concerns of the public.
- An articulation of values that connect what we want to do with a set of fundamental American values'. This was suggested by one organization, The Children's Partnership, and goes to the heart of our problem with a message. We have not figured out a way to communicate with individuals about actions we want them to take as individuals, parents, and citizens in a way which is consistent with fundamental values that they hold.
- A lack of understanding of attitudinal barriers or negative associations that stand in the way of action.
- A lack of an understanding of how media shapes public opinion. According to one operating foundation, those who are doing the investing do not realize that without campaign finance reform, the big spenders on campaigns saturate the media. Children and children's advocates are small pawns in a much larger game. Foundations need to work together to attack this problem. They need to see communications as a strategy way beyond the support of their individual efforts and work together in new ways on this issue.
- A need to better understand the interconnectedness of community building, service learning, volunteerism, public will and civic engagement.

Identification of Opportunities

Finally, based on the interviews with other foundations, there are considerable opportunities for collaboration between foundations:

- Many foundations voiced an interest in knowing the results of the work reported in this progress report.
- The Foundation for Child Development voiced an interest in convening foundations around issues related to creating the public will to invest in children.
- Several major foundations are exploring how to invest in this area. At the same time, they identified a set of gaps consistent with gaps identified here. For this reason, there may be an ability to convene five to ten foundations and develop a foundation collaboration around this area similar to the Annie E Casey Foundation-led Assessment of Devolution and the collaborative of foundations interested in violence prevention. Potential participants are: David and Lucille Packard, Robert Wood Johnson, W. K. Kellogg, Ewing Kauffman, Ford, Charles Stewart Mott, Foundation for Child Development, and perhaps Carnegie and AT&T. Because of their experience, Kaiser and California Wellness might also be part of the group though their agenda in the public will area is more fully developed at this point.

V. LANDSCAPE — MESSAGES

This section of the progress report pulls out some of the key points that relate specifically to the development of messages to support public will work in the children and family policy arena. It draws from our interviews with foundations and organizations, from our review of effective campaigns outside the children's area, and from experience of the authors in marketing research and advertising, as well as social policy.

' ***Bolded items were used as probes. Items not bolded were suggested by interviewees.***

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

Obviously, efficacious messages are a critical component of strategies that change behaviors. As a field, on the one hand we have not payed enough attention to the development of messages that change behaviors, and on the other, we have acted as though we expect good messages alone to move our agenda forward.

Message development is difficult for two reasons:

- First, we can't even work on good messages until we know the behaviors we are trying to change and therefore, the audience to be addressed; and
- Messages about children and family issues are intertwined in ways we don't fully understand with values and beliefs about race and racism, the role of government, equity and religion.

As noted in the framework section, good messages have to be embedded in comprehensive strategies to improve outcomes for children and families, not just in advertising or published materials but in our policy-setting, system reform, programming, daily advocacy and even our thinking about our work. Further, it seems increasingly clear that the language used by children's advocates and policymakers who support collective responsibility for children (a progressive agenda) alienates many who otherwise support the well-being of children.

Thus, public will work requires serious and sophisticated work on language and messages. At a minimum, good messages for public will work have to satisfy several tough tests:*

- Effective messages must be heard by the intended audience given many other similar and competing messages about the same issue, as well as the multitude of messages on other topics (which may be much more important to the audience). In advertising language, they must cut through the "noise".
- Effective messages must resonate with what the audience already knows or believes, or give sufficient reasons for the audience to question what they know or believe.
- To promote change, effective messages must be targeted to where the audience is with respect to that change, and aimed at moving them further on a continuum.
- They must be understandable to the target audience. Unclear messages get lost in the noise. Even worse, they are heard but reinterpreted in unproductive or counterproductive ways. For example, unclear messages about family support have caused some audiences to equate family support with big government or socialism.
- They must be "framed" correctly. Framing refers to the way an idea is presented. For example, advocates often personalize a story to help people identify with the issue or problem being presented (e.g., need for child care). Research supported and disseminated by the Benton Foundation and others indicates that people tend to blame the victim when messages are framed this way, seeing the problem as individual rather than social and therefore requiring a collective solution.
- They must provide resolution — that is, a next step, specific action or way of thinking that allows the audience to discharge whatever anxiety, discomfort or excitement the message generates.

In addition, effective messages often include some information or insight that helps the targeted audience counter the most likely opposition to the message, and they make it very easy for targeted audiences to see themselves reflected in some way so they know the message is for them.

Great messages have three other characteristics:

- They move people to act even without a great deal of programmatic, organizing or other kinds of support;
- As noted earlier, they resonate with both committed and swing audiences; and
- They have "legs" — that is, the insight or core of the message lends itself to broad use and use over time; there are many ways to tweak, expand

* ***This list is based on the current review of the field as well as the author's experience in marketing research and advertising development.***

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

or represent the message so it continues to be fresh and compelling. Generally, messages with legs are based on powerful consumer insights or concepts that really capture the heart of an issue.

As these characteristics indicate, it is very hard to develop messages that meet even the minimum tests to change behavior. Great messages require even more research, expertise, creativity and luck. Further, even the best developed messages in the children's area are not embedded in comprehensive strategies on the order of those used to change smoking or seat belt behavior, or even to encourage adolescents to use deodorant or shave. So it should not be surprising that there are few (some say no) truly successful examples of message-based behavior change in the children's arena, though there are many examples of interesting or arresting messages.

Chart V.1 illustrates a sampling of messages currently being used to support public will efforts in the children's area. Information is taken from materials prepared for public will work purposes, and thus, overrepresents broad public messages (in comparison to internal messages used in discussion or working papers).

The first column shows the sponsoring or disseminating organization or effort. The second and third columns display the message and what is known about insights that underlie the message. Information about how the message has been (or will be) used are in the last column.

Our review suggests the landscape in the area of message development has the following characteristics:

- There are multiple and simultaneous messages about how to improve outcomes for children and their families. There is general agreement in the field that these messages are not creating a cumulative effect on behaviors, though there is no evidence to support or refute this belief. In fact, several experts (Blendon, the Ad Council, Glantz) believe that the noise created by the children's field itself is among the chief barriers to behavioral change.

  For example, in Connecticut right now, public will efforts are disseminating messages through a variety of channels and strategies about educational reform; community school readiness; children's outcomes generally; adolescent outcomes; early childhood programming and pre-school; access to health care; and educational equity. Messages and strategies are uncoordinated, although there are a number of state and local collaborations working on each of these issues.

- There are competing messages about how to improve outcomes for children and families. There is no agreement about the right message content to reach individuals, as noted in the last section. For example, some people believe we should talk about investing in children as a moral imperative, out of self-interest, as an investment in the future, as a critical strategy to empower parents, etc. Part of the dilemma is that the field sometimes acts as though audiences are monolithic, and a single message will suffice.

- Some of these differences also reflect genuine ideological differences of opinion. For example, messages of conservative Christian organizations reinforce the danger of allowing government to interfere or limit parental rights over their children. Polling and survey work (Lake, others) indicates that messages aimed at creating a greater collective responsibility for children's outcomes, particular for very young children before they enter school, are also perceived as supporting a greater role for government in family life.

- A connected finding is that many current messages do not make clear the values or ideologies that underlie them. Our interviews suggest that this is to make messages as broadly applicable as possible. Good marketing suggests, however, that more targeted messages that clearly tell the audience whether or not they are being addressed are more effective.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

In the absence of this clarity, audiences use "code words" to identify the source or motivation behind messages, so they can decide if the message is for them. Codes include "family values" for privacy, individuality and/or the far right, "collective or public action" for liberal, progressive and/or big government, "poor or at-risk" for people of color, or more specifically, African Americans, and so on.

These associations have become so powerful, in CAPD's opinion, that the original meaning of these words has been lost, making it very difficult for message developers to co-opt or expand their use to draw in new audiences.

- A number of messages have been crafted to improve outcomes by changing the behaviors of those most at risk or caretakers of those most at risk (to increase rates and timeliness of immunization, to improve contraceptive use, support abstinence or otherwise change the sexual behavior of adolescents, to encourage parents to read to their children, come to school or monitor their child's exposure to drugs, or to take advantage of available public services).

  Messages are used in strategies to inform and move people to action, often as part of broad public campaigns. The Children's Defense Fund and the Advertising Council have developed and disseminated a number of messages of these kinds, as have many public agencies.

  These messages are often based on focus group and survey work to identify the attitudes and behaviors of the targeted population, and to test concepts, language and various ways of framing or executing the message. It would be very useful to the field to have access to the often sophisticated research that is used in development of these messages. As part of the work reported here, we have accumulated a starting list of primary data collection that could be mined further.

  According to some experts, a concern is that messages targeted directly to those most at risk of poor outcomes have, over time, reinforced ideas among the non-targeted population that certain kinds of people (adolescents, people of color, poor people) are less informed about appropriate behavior than others and/or are more likely to make poor choices or to exhibit inappropriate individual responsibility.

- People doing public will work point to some messages that have stimulated their intended actions. Two examples are the messages developed for the California Wellness Violence Prevention Initiative, which have elicited policy and legislative support for gun safety legislation, and the recent campaign jointly developed by the Ad Council and the Benton Foundation, which has stimulated more than 30,000 calls for follow-up materials or wanting to know more about volunteer opportunities. People involved with these efforts are aware of the limitations and next steps necessary to fully realize their goals. But in terms of messages, they believe the messages in place do achieve their short-term aims.

  As with the messages above, these were developed from focus groups, surveys, concept development and other steps (e.g., pre-tests) whose results could be quite useful to the field.

  For example, according to one of its developers, the message developed for the California Wellness Violence Prevention work was based on the insight that people need to support public gun safety policy to protect themselves from "armed children" who are becoming increasingly violent. According to its developers, the insight that underlies the Who's For Kids and Who's Just Kidding campaign and its associated messages is that people are moved to support individuals who are trying to help themselves against social odds they can't control. Both of these messages resonated with large numbers of people from very different social, educational, racial and political backgrounds, and thus, they need to be considered as potentially unifying messages.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

At the same time, both messages represent and reinforce the idea that society is polarized and that some members of society are more deserving of help than others. The message developers didn't make this up, in fact, they found that this is one of the core beliefs that unites very different people, which explains its value for public will work. However, as was noted above, reinforcing this message makes it that much harder to overcome it should the field want to (or find it useful to) develop messages with an opposing view, for example, to support universal rather than targeted supports for families and children.

Beyond these specific findings, there are two other points we would like to mention. The first has to do with values, and the second with race and racism.

Values That Underlay Message Development

As noted in the previous chapter, the Children's Partnership is among the organizations calling for the children and family policy field to link its public will work and, specifically, its message development, more directly to values that people hold. This is certainly one of the basic tenets adhered to by professional marketers in the private sector. Nearly every advertising strategy for personal care products, for example, begins with extensive focus group work to identify the values that people hold around issues like health and hygiene, self-esteem and/or parenting, depending on the product. This is because marketers recognize that people act in accordance with their values, and, further, they pick out messages from "noise" that are most closely aligned with the values they hold.

In the children and family policy area, we have been slow to adopt similar strategies both in policy development and message development. As noted above, it appears that people have kept core values implicit, rather than explicit, in our work to avoid alienating people unnecessarily.

However, CAPD believes there are several other reasons why we as a field have been so reluctant to declare our values. These reasons include:

- People in the field assume that others share similar values.
- Discussions about values raise issues about personal religious and spiritual beliefs, race and racism, and political ideology that are often uncomfortable to discuss openly.
- Those in the field with a progressive or liberal agenda are reluctant to declare themselves liberals or progressives, given current anti-liberal sentiment.

CAPD believes it is important to address these issues in order to develop more effective public will work. Ambiguity about the link between policies and values shows up in our messages, and to some extent, in the policies we promote. For example, there is no consistency in the field about whether or not to promote universal or targeted supports of various kinds. While this decision has practical implications, it also links to values about fairness, individual and collective responsibility, whether or not children have individual rights, etc. While we would not argue to declare values explicitly without further testing, we would certainly argue that we should make it easier for people who share the same values to recognize policies that build from them.

Further, it seems clear that the field has genuine disagreements based on differences in values. The better we understand them, the better we can speak to audiences, including those who share the same ambiguities or differences of opinion.

Race and Racism as They Apply to Public Will Work

Race and racism are considered in a lot of the message development work that is done. For example, the field tests messages on different racial groups, it recognizes that some of the unwillingness of the broad American public to support investments in improving children's outcomes reflects racist attitudes and misperceptions about who will benefit from those supports, etc. However, there are other ways in which race and racism might be better reflected in our public will work.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

- As a field, the children and family policy arena does not usually include racism, or more specifically, institutional racism, as an explicit part of the diagnosis about poor outcomes, in comparison to work on environmental racism or economic equity, for example. Because we don't do that, our proposed policies generally do not reflect strategies to address institutional racism as a part of the solution.
- One's theory about what it takes to change behaviors is based on part on life experiences. Beliefs about confrontation, how systems work, how resources are allocated, who has power and what it takes to alter it, and whether or not working within current systems is effective are often linked to life experiences related to race and racism. Cultural competence in message development should likely consider these issues more fully.
- There is a growing interest in the children and family policy field in sharing evidence about what works as a way of convincing people at the individual and policy level that there are strategies worth implementing. One's belief in the credence of certain kinds of evidence reflects one's ideas about how the world works, and, as noted above, this may be linked to racial experiences in ways that the children and policy field doesn't recognize or capture well in its messages.
- Understandings about white privilege, denial and internalized oppression are of course central to anti-racism work but not usually reflected in our messages about children and family outcomes. For example, literature about race and racism talks about "white culture" as a distinct form of culture seldom recognized by white people, but nearly always recognized by people of color. One aspect of white culture, reflecting white privilege, is the belief of many white people that America is a meritocracy; that is, good outcomes are more the result of hard work and good decision making than luck or the circumstances of one's birth.

  Because white culture is the predominant culture in America, white people generally don't question this belief, or necessarily recognize how it affects their values about children and families.

  An important advance in our public will work would be to understand more about this and other implicit values in white culture, as part of our development of messages aimed at changing behaviors of white people, including many key policymakers and individuals.

VI. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

This section of the progress report summarizes briefly the key findings from our review of public will work outside the children's arena and the landscape of public will work within the children's arena, and highlights some of the implications of those findings for next steps.

Landscape and State of the Art

- There are several examples of public will work outside the children's arena that illustrate the key components of a comprehensive strategy to mobilize public support to improve specific outcomes. Further, lessons from these efforts show how to put an issue on the "front-burner", how to mobilize committed but not previously active supporters, how to draw in "swing voters" or those on the fence about an issue, and how to create support for additional investments. Major components of this kind of effective public will work include:
  - a clear and disciplined focus on the outcomes to be achieved and the behaviors necessary to achieve them;
  - effective grassroots organizing, including meticulous follow-through; and
  - specific kinds of message development and communication strategies embedded throughout the work.
- There are also some conceptual frameworks that can provide a template for how to think about public will work. For example, a framework discussed in this report — social marketing broadly defined — emphasizes:
  - that the consumer (and not the policymaker) is the ultimate decision maker about whether a policy will be adopted;

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

  - that the end goal of public will work is to change behaviors (to create action), not just to inform or educate; and
  - that there are a host of intervening behaviors and conditions to be changed to affect the final outcome.
- There are considerable technical resources in and outside of the children and family policy field with expertise in message development, communication strategies and policy analyses which can be tapped to aid in development of more comprehensive public will strategies.
- Communication people within foundations often have a broad conception of their work, recognizing that communication is itself a programmatic strategy that needs to be part of an effort to improve outcomes. This perspective is not always respected by programmatic staff.
- Within the children and family policy arena, there are examples of initiatives that have moved toward a more comprehensive approach to public will work. Examples we reviewed include teen pregnancy and violence prevention initiatives supported by the California Wellness Foundation and some of the health care work sponsored by the Henry Kaiser Family Foundation. Though we did not review it here, it should be noted that the Education Reform work in Kentucky, starting with work of the Pritchard Committee and the Annie E. Casey Foundation, is another example with lessons for the field. These efforts are distinguished in part by the way in which communication is considered a programmatic strategy integral to achieving the desired outcomes.
- The children and policy field is quite interested right now in exploring how best to do its public will work. For example, concurrent with work reported here, other people are also looking at social movements to glean critical elements of comprehensive public will strategies that achieve their intended outcomes. Through this work, the field is getting a better understanding of what to do.
- Further, discussions are taking place within foundations and organizations, at Wingspread, through conferences sponsored by the Benton Foundation and elsewhere to refine our thinking in this area and begin to develop a collaborative sense of next steps. The fact that consistent lessons are emerging from so many different directions should give us some confidence in its validity.
- There are many different people doing pieces of public will work, but we could do much more sharing, collaboration or even arguing with each other to advance the state of the art in the field.
  - There is a great deal of separate message development work, but not much sharing of underlying insights and learnings from primary data collection (surveys, polls, focus groups) so others can benefit and perhaps glean new or different insights; and
  - There are many separate public will campaigns around specific children and family issues, but, except in the child care area, no attempt to coordinate them nationally or around a more comprehensive strategy.
- In the children and family policy arena, we are generally not doing our work cumulatively, so that each initiative, project or public will effort contributes in its own way but also, where possible, adds to a coherent whole. This is true of our work in school readiness, health care and family support. An exception has been work funded by the Ford Foundation and others in the child care arena.
- Because of this, some experts believe the field's public will work contributes to the multiple and simultaneous messages in a given community and nationally about children's well-being. There is no evidence to suggest this work is creating cumulative effects on people's attitudes or behaviors toward child well-being, suggesting missed opportunities.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

- Even with this interest and all of the potential resources, as a field, we generally do not implement initiatives that embed within them all of the public will work other campaigns have found necessary to create measurable changes in key outcomes. Looking across most initiatives and the field as a whole,
  - we have not developed concise messages about what we want to achieve or the behaviors necessary to achieve them;
  - we haven't broken our outcomes into smaller goals to keep us focused and enable us to celebrate successes;
  - we have not done not enough work to link values to strategies, to make sure we are talking about what people really care about in ways that resonat for them;
  - with some exceptions, we are not doing sophisticated segmentation and targeting work; and
  - we have not built effective local grassroots networks of people who care desperately about the issues, and who are trained and mobilized to act.
- Further, as a field, we have not been particularly effective in engaging parents as citizens to support investments in improving outcomes for children. We haven't created an effective grassroots movement, nor mobilized a broad constituency.

Implications

- This area is one where the field can learn a lot from each other and from others doing similar work. Grantees, foundations, technical assistance providers and policymakers have a lot to learn both from their peers, and from those in other spheres of the work.
- There is a kind of chicken and egg dilemma about furthering this work. On the one hand, good public will work relies on knowing the behaviors to be changed and the specific audiences who must be targeted to create the necessary changes. At the same time, we believe it is possible to do some basic research development work on issues that underlie behaviors that cross several outcomes for children and families. For example, the field would benefit from better definitions and language around values as they related to various policies for children.
- We currently do not have working consensus about a conceptual framework or language to support our public will work — different people in the field are doing similar things but talking about them differently. This suggests that it may be a good moment to develop better ideas and ways of discussing ideas, because so many people in the children and family arena are turning their attention to "public will work" without a lot of preconceived notions about what it is or how best to do it.
- A critical issue is the extent to which key people in the field have not worked through differences about the adequacy of the strategies we propose, and thus, the behaviors that would need to be changed to improve children and family outcomes. As a field, we need to confront ideological differences, look at values, consider whether or not our proposals are reasonable and palatable for those they are intended to benefit. This also suggests we need to be clearer about what we know and where our evidence is really limited.
- Message work needs to deal more thoroughly with the unspokens — values, race and racism, ideology and our theories about how to change behaviors. Listening more to consumers on these issues will help us craft better messages, and may also lead to developing policies more in synch with the values people hold.
- Findings also imply that we should treat attempts to outcomes more like political campaigns — paying more attention to notions about core and swing voters, how to shore up our allies and give those on the fence reasons to join us.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

- Looking at findings together indicates that we are not doing our public will work as "smart" as we can. Equally important, findings suggest we are greatly underspending on public will work. In particular, as a field, we seldom help communities find the resources necessary to embed effective public will work fully into their work to improve outcomes.
- At a national level, a good standard to measure the level of investment required would be the magnitude of effort and resources required by the Christian Coalition, the National Rifle Association, AIDS activists and the National Breast Cancer Coalition to achieve their intended outcomes.

VII. POTENTIAL NEXT STEPS

This section provides CAPD's early thinking about investments that foundations could make to advance the state of the art in public will work, and to use public will work more effectively to support improved outcomes for children and families. The first section presents ideas that a group of foundations could work on together. The second shares some thoughts about how an individual foundation might develop a unique niche in public will work, if it so chose.

Potential Areas of Foundation Investment, Including Cross-Foundation Collaborations

- Embed public will thinking and work into place-based strategies and initiatives.
  - Immediate or short-term options:
    - Help communities and collaborative planning and implementation groups analyze their public will needs from a social marketing/public will framework: help them develop clarity about outcomes to be achieved, behaviors required to achieve them, audiences to be influenced and potential influence strategies.
    - Set realistic budgets and help communities fund necessary social marketing/public will work once the behaviors to be changed have been identified.
    - Convene grantees as well as relevant local foundations within a given geographic area to work together on these issues.
    - Provide opportunities and funding for peer groups (parents, legislators, etc.) to work together across communities, particularly communities within the same state.
  - Long-term options:
    - To the extent possible, provide support for the development and maintenance of local grass-roots organizing capacity as both a part of and a legacy from place-based strategies that foundations support. Consider providing access to expertise from other effective campaigns, leadership development and grant making, funds for child care, travel, software, hardware, mailing and related out-of-pocket expenses, and access and links to Internet aided organizing efforts.
- Develop cross-foundation work to support setting the stage for broad improvements in children's outcomes at the national level.
  - Immediate or short-term options:
    - Establish a consortium of funders, organizations, advocacy groups, communities and others working to improve children and family outcomes who are also exploring additional investments in public will work. Build on partnerships created for Wingspread conferences, including the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Foundation for Child Development, The Ford Foundation, The Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, California Wellness Foundation, the Henry Kaiser Family Foundation and perhaps Carnegie and AT&T.
    - Have the consortium identify a few key related children and family supports or outcomes with immediate relevance to work being supported by the foundation community and of concern at the policy level (e.g., tied to devolution of responsibility for children and family outcome at the state level): for example, access to good quality child care as it relates to welfare reform; universal access to medical care for children; school readiness; performance in early grades in school.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

Convene foundations and organizations working in this area to reflect on the landscape, review the state of the art and lessons learned and allow them to learn from some of the good work in the field (e.g., from California Wellness).

- Invest in collaborative values clarification, message and language development, and identification of key segments to target based on collaborative analysis about behaviors to be changed. Draw on experienced technical assistance providers and consultants, but also look outside the field for people from a variety of ideological and professional experiences.

  One early step might be a meta-analysis of focus group, survey research, polling and other data that individual organizations have already collected to support their own message development work. Once work is collected, it would be useful to have it analyzed from a variety of ideological perspectives, professional and life experiences, and by people from different races.

- Long-term options:
  - Once basic R&D work on values clarification, message and language development has been done to identify key segments and how to address them, translate some of the analysis and proposals developed by the policy field into language that motivates and resonates with the public.
  - Support development of local next generation advocacy which focuses on creating grassroots support and effective grassroots strategies to promote a progressive children's agenda, using lessons learned from effective campaigns and proposals laid out at Wingspread. (See related point under place-based strategies above.)
  - Support development of a collaborative implementation strategy aimed at improving one key outcome using a social marketing or similar template.
  - Develop a cross-site and cross-foundation conference to share ideas with grantees and communities who want to embed public will work into their local initiatives. Communities doing school readiness are one candidate that could apply learnings directly to their work; as are communities committed to system reform to improve child and family outcomes.

Creating a Niche in Public Will Work

In presenting ideas above, we have deliberately not suggested priorities within the list of ideas. Because the field is currently under-invested in this work, it is more important to think of these ideas as a cumulative strategy that should be implemented over time, beginning with the first steps noted above and working through the rest as quickly as funding and knowledge development allows.

While these ideas could be supported by many of the foundations exploring the public will area, we believe that there is a way a single foundation to create a special niche in public will work. A niche development strategy might include the following types of efforts and investments:

- As noted above, be a lead foundation in embedding new thinking about public will work and social marketing, broadly defined, into all its place-based work;
- As noted above, be a lead foundation to convene the foundation community, and relevant grantees and thinkers, in supporting and sharing thinking, lessons and new ideas in the field;
- Create a baseline and track changes in attitudinal markers over time. If appropriate, embed the tracking system in related ongoing measurement work, e.g. KIDS COUNT, a poverty index; social indicators, school readiness indicators, etc.
- Be a lead foundation to call the question and support work on values, ideologies, race and other "unspokens" as part of both policy and message development. Work with other foundations (e.g., Levi Strauss, the Fetzer Institute, Rockefeller and Carnegie) to develop "safe spaces" and dissemination strategies that will allow this work to reach a wide audience in the children and family policy field.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

- Once this work is far enough along, be a lead foundation to focus on a core set of behaviors to change, at a level of discipline and with the magnitude of effort demonstrated by effective campaigns outside the children's area.
- Create an ongoing forum to share lessons as they are being learned, in a fashion of direct value to communities and others promoting behavior change.
- Help the field, and particularly the foundation community, establish a set of common goals for our public will work, with interim markers of progress, to which we can hold ourselves accountable and which will allow us to celebrate interim success and make mid-course corrections.
- When the work is sufficiently implemented, be among the foundations that support innovative ways of measuring its effectiveness in terms of actual behaviors changed.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ad Council Packet — Commitment 2000: Raising a Better Tomorrow.

AIDS Information Network (Fall, 1996). *Critical Path AIDS Project.* Philadelphia, PA: AIDS Information Network.

AT&T. (1996). *Whose Side Are You On?*

Benton Foundation/Coalition For America's Children/KidsCampaigns. (1996). *Information Packets.*

Blair, E. (1995). The marketing of guns to women: Factors influencing gun-related attitudes and gun ownership. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing,* 14, 117-120.

Bozell (August 7, 1995). Helms and AIDS: The media's latest field day. *Indianapolis Business Journal,* 6B.

Braus, P. (1995). Selling good behavior. *American Demographics,* 17, 60.

Brewer, G. (1996). Overcoming customers' discomfort. *Sales and Marketing Management,* 148, 39.

Brunet, R. (July 22, 1996). Maybe they don't want a cure. *Alberta Report/Western Report,* 23, 30-34.

The California Wellness Foundation. World Wide Web Page *www.tcwf.org.*

Centers for Disease Control (1996). Community-level prevention of human immunodeficiency virus infection among high risk populations: The AIDS community demonstration projects. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report,* 45(RR-6).

Center for the Future of Children (1996). Executive Summary, *Financing Child Care,* Volume 6, Number 2.

Chapin Hall Center for Children (1996). *Projects and Publications. The Power of Knowing.*

Children Now. World Wide Web Page children@dnai.com.

Children's Defense Fund (1996). World Wide Web Page www.cdf.org.

Children's Partnership (1996). *America's Uninsured Children and the Changing Policy Environment.* A strategic audit of activities and opportunities. Washington, DC.

Clinton, W. (1995). Remarks to the White House conference on HIV and AIDS. *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents,* 31, 2132.

Collins, J. G. (September 2, 1995). Jodeci offers UrbanAID for LIFEbeat. *Michigan Citizen.*

Dabney, M. (August 11, 1995). City focuses on minority HIV/AIDS awareness: African Americans. *The Philadelphia Tribune.*

Deardourff, J. (1996). Public opinion: A dynamic political context for building a constituency for children's issues. In The Children's Partnership (Ed.), *Building a constituency for children: Community and national strategies — Wingspread conference summary and highlights.* Washington, D.C.: The Children's Partnership.

Dreyfuss, R. (July 1996). Good morning, gun lobby! *Mother Jones.*

Duston, D. (September 27, 1995). Pernessa C. Seele: Prayer-education-advocacy HIV/AIDS trailblazer. *New York Beacon.*

Ehrenreich, B. (December 4, 1992). Media matters. *The Nation,* 698.

Everding, G. (December 6, 1995). Aggressive HIV prevention campaign launched. *Oakland Post.*

Family Research Council. Articles reviewed on World Wide Web.

Family Violence Prevention Fund. Articles reviewed on World Wide Web.

Farkas, Steve (1995). *Public Attitudes Toward Welfare and Welfare Reform: A Focus Group Report by Public Agenda.* Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation.

Ford Foundation. Articles reviewed on World Wide Web.

Gallagher, J. (August 20, 1996). Network: Insider activism powers the organization Hollywood supports. *The Advocate,* 45-46.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

Gallagher, J. (July 25, 1995). Money talks: Gay and AIDS activists are increasingly banking on hired professionals to help reach Republicans in congress. *The Advocate,* 41-42.

Gelb, M. (1995). Word of mouth communication causes and consequences. *Journal of Health Care Marketing,* 15, 54-59.

Haldane, D. (June 3, 1996). Memorial stirred at 10th AIDS walk; Activism: About $355,000 raised to fight disease that has claimed loved many among the marchers. *Los Angeles Times, Orange County Edition,* B-1.

Helms, J. E. (1992). *A race is a nice thing to have: A guide to being a White person or understanding the White persons in your life.* Topeka, KS: Content Communications.

Heritage Foundation. Articles from World Wide Web.

Horn, F. Wade. (July 7, 1991). Children and Family in America: Challenges for the 1990's. *Internet web page: www.herelage.*

Hudson Institute. (October 1996). *Shifting Engagements: Lessons from the "Bowling Alone" Debate.*

Kennedy, R. L. (December 31, 1995). Conservatism's would-be spokesmen: *From soft sell to demagoguery. Quarterly Black Review of Books.*

Lovelace, C. (December 1, 1995). Are we too tired to fight AIDS? *Newsday,* A61.

Lucas, A. (1996). Heart and sole. *Sales and Marketing Management,* 148, 30-35.

The Markle Foundation. Internet Web Page: infor@markle.org.

Charles Stewart Mott Foundation (1995). *America's Tattered Tapestry: Can We Reclaim our Civility Through Connectedness?* Flint, MI.

National Breast Cancer Coalition. (1996). *Information Packets.*

National Center for Children in Poverty (1996). *The Campaign to Reduce The Young Child Poverty Rate.*

National Rifle Association (1996). Five steps to successfully protect your firearm freedoms. *Internet web page: www.nra.org.*

National Rifle Association (1996). Protect your second amendment rights by exercising your right to vote. *Internet web page: www.nra.org.*

National Rifle Association. (1996). Guidelines for communicating. *Internet web page: www.nra.org.*

National Rifle Association. (1996). Grassroots development: Start your own grassroots network. *Internet web page: www.nra.org.*

National Rifle Association. (1996). Influencing legislation by communicating with lawmakers. Internet web page: www.nra.org.

National Rifle Association. (1996). The NRA-ILA grassroots network and resources for NRA-ILA volunteers. *Internet web page: www.nra.org.*

National Rifle Association. (1996). Start a phone tree. *Internet web page: www.nra.org.*

Ogunlade, T. (March 23, 1995). Condom campaigns fall on deaf ears: Despite massive publicity about. *The Weekly Journal.*

Olasky, M. *Loving your neighbor.* Capital Research Center.

Reed, Ralph. (1996). *Active Faith.* NY: Free Press.

Reed, Ralph. (1996). *Active Faith.* NY. Freeman Press.

Siegel, J. (November 30, 1995). Information efforts to mark world AIDS day. *Jerusalem Post.*

Skocpol, T. (1997). Lessons from history: *Building a movement for America's children.* Washington, D.C.: The Children's Partnership.

Skocpol, T. (1996). A children's movement and the broader history of American social movements. In The Children's Partnership (Ed.), *Building a constituency for children: Community and national strategies — Wingspread conference summary and highlights.* Washington, D.C.: The Children's Partnership.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

Some Thoughts About Public Will (cont.)

Smolowe, J. (May 29, 1995). Go ahead, make our day: The NRA suffers a public backlash for its extremism, but that is precisely the source of its newfound strength. Time, 18-22.

Sonenshein, R. (1996). Ten essential elements in an American social movement. In The Children's Partnership (Ed.), *Building a constituency for children: Community and national strategies — Wingspread conference summary and highlights.* Washington, D.C.: The Children's Partnership.

Sugarmann, J. (1992). NRA: National Rifle Association, money-power-fear. Washington, DC: National Press Books.

Unknown (January 18, 1996). NRA duo's aim: Hard line, softer image. *USA Today.*

Unknown (March 1994). Eddie Eagle safeguards children nationwide. American Rifleman, 35-37.

Unknown. (September/October 1996). Two Ways to Handle a "Hostile" Request. *Foundation New and Commentary.* 37, 53.

Vaid, U. (1995). *Virtual equality: The mainstreaming of gay and lesbian liberation.* NY: Anchor Books.

Wachter, R. M. (1991). *The fragile coalition: Scientists, activists, and AIDS.* NY: St. Martin's Press.

The Washington Post/Kaiser Family Foundation/Harvard Survey Project (December 1995). *The Four Americas: Government and Social Policy Through the Eyes of America's Multi-racial and Multi-ethnic Society.*

The Washington Post/Kaiser Family Foundation/Harvard University Survey Project (1996). *Why Don't Americans Trust the Government?*

Weems, C. (April 1, 1995). Omnipotent NRA gets what it wants. *Atlanta Inquirer.*

Zachary, B. (March 21, 1995). Winning the war. *The Advocate,* 59-62.

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.

APPENDIX 1

Foundation/Organization Interview List

Susan Bales
The Benton Foundation
The Coalition of America's Children

Susan Blank
Program Officer
Foundation for
Child Development

Robert Blendon
Harvard University

John Clark
Hudson Institute

Tamar Datan
The Pew Charitable Trusts

Pat Fagan
Heritage Foundation

Linda Glantz
Martin and Glantz

Deanna Gomby
Deputy Director
The David & Lucile
Packard Foundation

Bob Huberty
Capital Research Center

Matt James
Henry Kaiser Family Foundation

Karen Lake
Director of Communications
W.K. Kellogg Foundation

Carol Larson
Director of Foundation Programs
The David & Lucile
Packard Foundation

Paul Light
Communications & Public Policy
The Pew Charitable Trusts

Laurie Lipper
Co-Director
Children's Partnership

Marvin McKinney
Youth & Child Development
W.K. Kellogg Foundation

Janice Molnar
The Ford Foundation

Lloyd Morrisett
President
The John & Mary R. Markle Foundation

Mary O'Connell
Communications Officer
The Joyce Foundation

Barbara Reisman
Executive Director
Child Care Action Campaign

Linda Rich
Health & Human Services
The Pew Charitable Trusts

Russ Russell
Urban Health Initiative
R. W. Johnson Foundation

Judy Samelson
Communications
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

Lynn Spencer
Director of Communications
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Paul Tarini
Department of Communications
R. W. Johnson Foundation

Gayle Wilson
The California Wellness Foundation

Eugene R. Wilson
Youth Development
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

© Copyright February 2000 by Center for Assessment and Policy Development. All rights reserved.